DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 304 772 EA 020 785

AUTHOR Rose, Terry L.; And Others
TITLE Current Practices and Procedures in the Use of Substitute Teachers.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services (ED), Washington, DC.
PUB DATE 87
GRANT G008535103
NOTE 27p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Board of Education Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Occupational Information; Public Schools; School Statistics; Statistical Distributions; *Substitute Teachers; *Teacher Evaluation; Teacher Orientation; *Teacher Qualifications; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

This report provides statistics on employment, evaluation, and training practices and procedures of American public school substitute teachers. A questionnaire was mailed to the directors of substitute teachers in 401 randomly selected school districts. Usable information was returned by 259 school systems (64.6 percent) in 49 states and the District of Columbia. Frequencies were tabulated for 25 variables pertaining to employment practices and procedures in large, medium, and small school districts. Findings generally demonstrate that a majority of school districts may employ unqualified or minimally qualified persons to substitute for absent teachers, offer them little or no training to perform that role, and then not evaluate their performance. Included is a table of questionnaire items with responses in frequencies and percentages. (JAM)

**********
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
**********

ED304772

# Current Practices and Procedures in the Use of Substitute Teachers

Terry L. Rose, John R. Beattie, and Richard White

Department of Curriculum and Instruction

University of North Carolina at Charlotte

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Terry L. Rose

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Running Head: Substitutes

Preparation of the manuscript was supported in part by Grant # G008535103 from the Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services, U.S. Department of Education to the University of North Carolina at Charlotte.

The authors gratefully acknowledge the assistance of Lisa Corum for her assistance during the data collection.

Address all correspondence to Dr. Terry L. Rose, Department of Curriculum and Instruction, University of North Carolina at Charlotte, Charlotte, NC 28223.

EA 020 785



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Abstract

The practices and procedures in the use of substitute teachers in American public schools are described. A substitute teacher questionnaire was mailed to 401 randomly selected school systems in all 50 states and the District of Columbia. Results regarding the employment practices, procedural practices, and demographic information are provided and discussed. Further research directions and instructional implications are also discussed.

Current Practices and Procedures in the Use of Substitute Teachers

Substitute teachers constitute a major force in our public schools. While few current data are available regarding the incidence of substitute teaching nationally, a few authors have discussed the extent to which substitute teachers have an impact upon the education of public school students. A national survey reveals that substitute teachers are responsible for a much as 5.43% of scheduled school days (Heckman, 1981). That is, students spend between 7 and 10 school days per year with a substitute teacher (Drake, 1981; McIntire & Hughes, 1982). The magnitude of these number of absences and the potential for lost instructional time may be problematic depending on the quality and training of the teachers who substitute on these occasions.

Few empirically based studies are available that describe the uses of substitute teachers in American public schools. The Educational Research Service (ERS) reported the results of a national survey conducted during the 1976-77 academic year that appears to be the most comprehensive effort to date (1977). In general, ERS found that substitute teachers were often not required to have obtained the same minimum academic degree as that expected of regular teachers, were rarely evaluated formally, and rarely received orientation or inservice training. Apparently, no special training is required to be a substitute teacher. Others have concluded that a large majority of people selected to substitute teach are often trained inappropriately or not at all (Koelling, 1983). Substitute teachers are generally unemployed prospective teachers, retired teachers, or people with college degrees with

no teaching certification (Juntzen & Vockell, 1978) who are often selected simply because they are available (Elliot & Manlove, 1977).

Indeed, the role of the substitute teacher, in general, is vague. The primary goal of substitute teachers varies from district to district, with some being viewed as merely "babysitters" while other require a more pedagogical role for their substitutes. However, in either extreme, the substitute teacher is often judged to be "good" if he/she keeps the students in the classroom without excessive noise, prevents anyone from being injured, and manages the classroom with a minimum of reliance upon the building principal (Esposito, cited in Drake, 1981). These minimum expectations for substitute teachers may represent a gross reduction in the amount of instructional time available to public school students, as well as a great waste of money.

Taxpayers rightfully question the manner in which tax dollars are spent. They demand accountability for their money and, to the extent that tax dollars support public education, demand progress by the children they send to school. Olson (cited in Elliott & Manlove, 1977) summarizes the issue clearly, "...substitute teacher performance must be improved or alternatively less expensive methods of handling teacher absences should be initiated" (p.270). Thus, financial concerns combine with educational concerns to lead to the inescapable conclusion that attempts must be made to better train and equip substitute teachers.

However, before improvements in the training of and expectations for substitute teachers can be made, a description of the current national practices and procedures must be available, especially since the most recent data available are from the 1976-77 academic year. The current study repre-

sents a partial replication and extension of the earlier ERS [illegible] study, in order to describe the current practices and procedures surrounding the use of substitute teachers in American public schools.

## Method

### Selection of Respondents

Eight school systems were selected randomly from each of the 50 states plus the District of Columbia, using Patterson's American Education (1984). In early May, 1985, each school system's director of substitute teachers received a letter explaining the rationale of the study, the voluntary nature of their participation, the use of group data, and an offer to share results along with the substitute teacher survey instrument and a stamped return envelope. A follow-up letter to non-respondents was mailed in mid-June, 1985.

Usable information was returned by 259 school systems (64.6%) in 49 states and the District of Columbia. Those who declined to participate or provided incomplete information were classified as nonusable responses. Very little is known about the respondents because no personal information was obtained. Quantitative descriptions of the pool of respondents may be found in Table 1.

---

Insert Table 1 about here

---

### Questionnaire

The questionnnaire asked for information about the respondents' demography and their practices and procedures in the employment, evaluation, and training of substitute teachers. It was designed to obtain a maximum of de-

scriptive information with a little effort by the respondents as possible. Of the 24 questions germane to this report, 22 were answered by selecting from three or more choices or required a yes-no response. The remaining two items asked for information that could not be predicted (i.e., the number of substitutes in a system's active file and their daily pay rate). These latter two items were subsequently categorized for data analysis purposes.

## Results

Data obtained from the substitute teacher survey may be analyzed most easily when subdivided into three categories: (a) employment practices, (b) procedural, and (c) demographic. Table 2 presents a frequency distribution of responses to each item on the questionnaire.

---

Insert Table 2 about here

---

### Employment Practices

Employment practices data refer to academic and certification requirements, selection factors, and removal practices. Also included are findings when these data are analyzed controlling for such factors as the size of the school district and geographic region.

Academic degree. As may be seen in Table 2, 34.7% of all responding school systems require that substitute teachers hold the same minimum academic degree as regular teachers. Significant differences were found when degree requirement data were analyzed controlling for region using the chi-square procedure: (8, N=239) = 56.85, $p<.001$. School systems in the New England, East North Central, and West North Central were more likely to have

tutes

minimum degree requirements, while those in the South Atlantic, East South Central, West South Central, and Mountain regions were less likely.

No differences were found when these data were analyzed controlling for school system size or availability of substitute teachers. This latter variable was analyzed in order to investigate the possibility that minimum degree requirements were related to the availability of substitute teachers (supply and demand).

Certification. Only 14.3% of all responding school systems require substitute teachers to hold certification in the areas in which they substitute. Significant differences were found when certification data were analyzed by region: $(8, N=237) = 28.90$, $p<.001$. Systems in the Middle Atlantic region were more likely to have this requirement, while school districts in the East South Central, West South Central, and Mountain regions were significantly less likely.

There were no findings of differential effects of certification requirements when analyzed by school system size.

Application consideration. As seen in Table 2, 62.7% of all responding school systems reported giving substitute teachers special consideration if they apply for a regular teaching job. Significant regional differences were noted: $(8, N=235) = 22.28$, $p<.01$. Systems in the Middle Atlantic, East South Central, and West South Central were more likely to give special consideration, while systems in the West North Central and Pacific regions were significantly less likely to.

There were no findings of differential effects of certification requirements when analyzed by school system size.

Selection for duty. Substitute teachers were selected for duty primarily on the basis of past performance as a substitute (89.8%); their training/-certification (85.1%); and upon the principal's request (84.3%). No differential effects were found when these data were analyzed controlling for school system size, except for "proximity". While only 19.6% of all responding school systems reported that the proximity to the school was a primary selection factor, larger school systems were significantly more likely to base a decision on this factor than were smaller systems: (3, N=250) = 9.23, $p$ = .03.

No differential effects were found using region as an independent variable.

Removal. Fully 92.1% of all responding districts reported that substitute teachers with poor performance records could be removed from the district's roster without a complicated procedure.

No differential effects were found when these data were analyzed controlling for system size or region.

Refuse assignment. In 89.3% of all responding school systems, there is no specific limit to the number of times a substitute teacher may refuse an assignment and still be kept on active file. Significant differences were found when these data were analyzed controlling for school system size: (3, N=248) = 23.75, $p<.001$. Larger districts were more likely to have limits (e.g., 37.0% of large districts have limits, while only 5.1% of the very small districts do). No differential effects were found when these data were analyzed by region.



BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Of the school systems with specific limits, 25.0% remove a substitute's name after the third refusal, 20.8% after the fifth, and 37.5% allow more than five refusals.

Solving a shortage. When a system must employ a substitute teacher in an area in which a shortage of substitute teachers is encountered, 64.9% of all responding school systems reported solving the problem by employing a non-certified substitute teacher and 13.6% reported canceling planning periods and other "free" periods for regular teachers. No differences were found when these data were analyzed using either school system size or region as an independent variable.

## Procedural Results

Procedural results refer to those data that describe such practices as evaluation, orientation, inservice, and materials supplied to substitute teachers.

Evaluation. Only 23.4% of all responding school systems formally evaluate the performance of their substitute teachers. The size of the school system was significantly related to evaluation practices: $(3, N=251) = 23.23$, $p<.001$. The larger the district, the more likely it is to have formal evaluation procedures. No differential effects were found when these data were analyzed by region.

Districts that require the same minimum academic degree for their substitutes as required of their regular teachers are significantly more likely to formally evaluate the performance of their substitute teachers: $(1, N=256) = 11.91$, $p = .005$ (i.e., 54.3% of all responding districts require neither the same degree nor evaluate, while 12.5% require the same degree and also evaluate).

The building principal performs the evaluation in 95.0% of the systems that evaluate, while the assistant principal (41.7%) and the teacher who was absent (36.7%) also have evaluation responsibilities. Substitute teachers are most often evaluated after either a long-term assignment (39.0%), at the principal's discretion (37.3%), and after each assignment (33.3%).

Training. Orientation programs were provided by 53.1% of all responding school systems. Significant differential effects were found when controlling for school system size: $(3,N=251) = 17.34$, $p = .005$. Larger districts are significantly more likely to provide orientation to substitute teachers (e.g., 85.2% of large districts do, while only 42.9% of very small do).

Inservice programs were provided by 35.8% of all responding school systems. Larger districts were significantly more likely to provide inservice to substitute teachers: $(3,N=249) = 20.70$, $p<.001$ (e.g., 66.7% of the largest districts do, while only 28.9% of very small do).

Of those providing inservice, the following were provided most often: reporting procedures (82.9%); responsibilities to school and children (82.9%); building regulations (80.0%); classroom management (74.3%); and building regulations (72.9%). Only 4.2% of all responding systems provide a subsitute teacher's handbook.

Materials provided. Items that school systems require regular teachers to make available to substitute teachers include: lesson plans (100%); seating chart or list of pupils' names (94.6%); copies of textbooks (96.1%); list of schedules, rules, events, etc. (94.9%); supplies, materials, equipment (92.6%); appropriate keys (62.6%); list of personal student information (e.g., disciplinary, emotional, medical) (49.8%).

Demographic Results

Demographic findings refer to the numbers of substitute teachers employed, their availability (supply), pay, and fringe benefits.

Number of substitutes available. For every 100 regular teachers employed, the median system employed between 10-20 substitute teachers. Further, 36.2% of the responding systems employ fewer than 10 substitutes per 100 regular teachers.

The median school system employed fewer than 10 substitute teachers per day. As may be expected, larger districts were significantly more likely to hire more substitute teachers: (21, N=250) = 281.37, $p<.001$ (e.g., 40.7% of the largest districts had more than 200 substitutes on duty per day, while 92.9% of the smallest districts have fewer than 10 on duty per day).

Of all responding school systems, 25.3% employed from 10 to 20 percent of their total available substitutes during a typical day; 48.6% employed fewer than 10 percent; and 10.0% employed between 20 and 30 percent. Smaller districts were significantly more likely to employ higher proportions of their available substitutes: (15,N=244) = 77.70, $p<.001$ (e.g., 77.0% of those systems employing 50% or more of their available substitutes per day were very small and small districts).

For every 100 regular teachers employed, the median system employed between 3 and 4 substitute teachers on a typical day. Larger systems were significantly more likely to employ a higher proportion of substitutes: (30, N=216) = 87.31, $p <.001$ (e.g., 77.8% of those systems replacing 10% or more of their regular teachers on a typical day were the largest districts).

No differential effects on any of the above were found when these data were analyzed controlling for region.

Availability. Of all responding school systems, 51.4% had an adequate supply of substitute teachers; 43.6% of the school systems had a shortage of substitute teachers; and only 4.4% reported a surplus of substitute teachers. The size of the system was related significantly to the supply of substitute teachers: $(8, N=250) = 19.15$, $p < .01$. Shortages occurred significantly more frequently in large systems (65.4% reported shortages). Surpluses were most likely to occur in medium size systems (13.8%), while no large system reported a surplus.

Significant regional differences were noted: $(16, N=235) = 45.76$, $p < .001$ (i.e., adequate supplies were most likely to occur in the West North Central region (75.8%) and the Mountain region (60.6%); surpluses were most likely in the West North Central region (9.1%) and the East South Central region (11.1%); shortages were most likely in the New England region (80.0%), the East South Central region (55.6%), and the West South Central (53.3%).

Shortages in substitute teachers were reported by all responding systems in the following grade levels: elementary school (50.0%); junior high (83.3%); high school (88.8%). Very small systems (93.9%) and large systems (89.5%) were significantly more likely to have shortages at the junior high level: $(3, N=131) = 8.39$, $p = .04$. Other differences according to system-size were not significant.

Significant regional differences were noted at the elementary school level: $(8, N=134) = 21.35$, $p < .01$. Adequate supplies were most likely in the Middle Atlantic, East North Central, and West North Central regions; shortages were most likely in the New England, South Atlantic, and West South Central regions.

Shortages in substitute teachers were reported by all responding systems in the following content areas: industrial arts (96.6%); science (98.0%); mathematics (98.1%); reading (77.7%); art (84.8%); business education (85.0%); music (92.2%); and physical education (69.8%).

Very small (90.3%) and large (91.7%) systems were significantly more likely to have shortages in reading: (3, N=90) = 8.75, $p$ = .03. The smaller the district, the more likely it is to have shortages in physical education: (3,N=93) = 8.34, $p$ = .04 (e.g., 81.8% of very small systems had shortages while only 69.2% of large systems did) and music: (3, N=125) = 8.66, $p$ = .04 (e.g., 98.0% of very small systems had shortages while only 76.5% of large systems did).

Regional differences were not statistically significant, but 100% of the systems in the following regions reported shortages in these areas: industrial arts - New England, Middle Atlantic, East South Central, and West South Central; science - New England, Middle Atlantic, East North Central, South Atlantic, East South Central, and West South Central; math - New England, Middle Atlantic, East North Central, East South Central, West South Central, and Pacific; reading - Middle Atlantic and West South Central; art - West South Central; business education - West South Central and Mountain; music - East South Central, West South Central, and Pacific; physical education - Mountain and Pacific.

Pay. The median pay range for substitute teachers was between $31-$35 per day; 49.0% reported paying more than $35 per day; and only 1.2% paid $20 or less per day. The size of the school system was not a statistically significant factor, but 84.4% of the systems that pay less than $30 per day are small and very small. Significant regional differences were found: (56,

N=232) = 256.82, $p < .001$. The South Atlantic, East South Central, and West South Central regions were most likely to pay less (e.g., 71.2% of systems in these regions pay $30 or less per day); the West North Central, Mountain, and Pacific regions were most likely to pay more (e.g., 69.3% of the systems in these regions pay $40 or more per day).

Fringe benefits. No fringe benefits were provided by 88.4% of all responding school systems. In the 11.6% providing some benefits, Social Security (65.4%) and teacher retirement (57.7%) were provided most often.

## Discussion

The findings of the current study indicate that regional variables affect procedures and practices regarding: (a) degree and certification requirements for substitute teachers; (b) whether substitutes receive extra consideration when applying for a regular teaching position; (c) the availability of subsitutes, in general, and in elementary schools, in particular; and (d) the pay substitutes receive. Regional differences were not found to be significant for the following: (a) evaluation practices; (b) training, including orientation and inservice; (c) the number and proportions of substitutes employed per day; (d) selection and removal practices; and (e) fringe benefits. In other words, these results are relatively consistent across the U.S.

The larger the school system, the more likely it is to: (a) require formal evaluation; (b) offer training, including orientation and inservice; (c) have established limits regarding the number of times a substitute can refuse an assignment; (d) employ more and a greater proportion of substitutes; and (e) have a shortage in the number of available substitutes. Smaller systems are more likely to: (a) employ a higher percentage of their available

substitutes and (b) have a shortage of substitutes in physical education and music. Both the largest and smallest districts are more likely to encounter shortages at the junior high level and in reading. Findings regarding (a) degree and certification requirements, (b) special consideration for regular employment, and (c) pay were relatively consistent regardless of the size of the school system.

The reader should be aware of several limitations of the present study before further conclusions are drawn. First, to insure prompt and complete responses by the respondents, relatively few items were included in the survey instrument. Further, some of these items may have restricted the range of answers that were possible because the respondents were forced to choose an answer from a preselected array of answers. Second, despite follow-up letters, variable Ns were obtained across regions, with a resulting lack of information about those respondents who did not respond vis-a-vis those who did. Third, questions regarding the generalizability of the present findings are related to the adequacy of the sample size.

Despite the various limitations, the present study documents the practices and procedures involved in the use of substitute teachers in public school settings in the United States. Thus, several tentative conclusions may be drawn.

The aspects of the current study that replicated the earlier ERS (1977) study yield findings of potential significance for educators. As may be seen in Table 3, requirements regarding minimum academic degrees, certification, and evaluation were in force in far fewer districts in 1984-85 than in the 1976-77 academic year. The number of districts with adequate availability of substitutes has decreased somewhat, while those with surpluses have decreas-

ed markedly and those with shortages have increased significantly. Further, fewer substitutes were employed by the median system in 1984-85 than in 1976-77. Substitutes are paid better today, but receive fringe benefits from far fewer districts. More districts provided training in 1984-85, but the current proportion of systems providing these activities are still quite low.

---

Insert Table 3 about here

---

The current results, and the comparison data discussed above, describe a set of practices and procedures that should be distressing for several reasons. One, the majority of school systems: (a) may employ substitute teachers with academic degrees that are less than their regular teachers must have earned and who are not required to be certified in the areas in which they teach; (b) do not formally evaluate the performance of their substitutes; and (c) do not provide inservice training. We can conclude that a majority of school districts may employ unqualified or minimally qualified persons to substitute for absent teachers, offer them little or no training to perform that role, and then not evaluate their performance. Rarely in any organization, (e.g., educational, military, or business) would this situation be tolerated, especially when approximately 5% of the work-year would be staffed by these individuals. Consider, for example, this situation occurring in the legal or medical profession.

Further, this situation is exacerbated by shortages in almost half the school systems in virtually every region at virtually all grade levels and content areas. Given a trend over the last nine years that indicates the

number of systems with shortages is increasing, while the number of those with an adequate supply of substitutes is decreasing, we may expect the above descriptors to apply to more systems in the future.

Two, given the continuing need for instructional personnel when the regularly assigned teacher is absent and the apparent minimal (and declining) standards for employing those substitute personnel, we may reasonably question the quality of the education our nation's public school students receive during the 7-10 days per year that they are taught by substitutes. Additionally, there are often occasions in which no substitute teacher is available. Typical solutions to this problem again raises a question as to the quality of education received by our nation's students. For example, school districts indicated that they most often employ non-certified substitutes when no other substitutes are available. However, many school districts also use one or more of the following approaches: (a) team teach, (b) cancel planning periods for other teachers, or (c) cancel specific classes (See Table 2). Clearly, these options do not provide for appropriate instruction for public school children.

The dilemma faced by school systems is how to resolve this situation and improve instructional quality when salaries remain low, budgets constrict, and fewer people choose to enter the teaching profession.

Three, substitute teachers face an uncertain work situation every day they go to work. Issues regarding the function and role of a substitute teacher have not been resolved, (although given the current data, we may infer that little quality education is, or should be, expected in most cases). Substitutes enter this uncertain, stressful work place for low pay,

usually no fringe benefits, with little training and rarely with any expectation of receiving any from their employer.

Given the above, the circumstances surrounding the use of substitute teachers should concern administrators, regular teacher, substitutes, parents, and taxpayers. However, the current data only describe those circumstances, rather than suggest avenues leading to meaningful improvements. Further studies should be conducted that obtain information from teachers, substitutes, and administrators regarding the expectations of and problems facing the substitute teacher. Specific instructional and management skills unique to the demands of substitute teaching await identification. Subsequent to this identification, efficacious training methods must be developed and validated.

In the meantime, teacher educators (pre-service) and staff development personnel (in-service) must begin to attend to the needs and problems of the substitute teacher. While awaiting data upon which empirical decisions can be made, both pre-service and in-service training personnel should begin to plan and implement training procedures that may begin to prepare education students and substitutes to be more effective as substitutes.

References

Drake, J.M. (1981). Making effective use of the substitute teacher: An administrative opportunity. NASSP Bulletin, 65, 74-80.

Educational Research Service, Inc. (1977). Practices and procedures in the use of substitute teachers. Arlington, VA: Author.

Elliot, P.G., & Manlove, D.C. (1977). The cost of skyrocketing teacher absenteeism. Phi Delta Kappan, 59, 269-271.

Hickman, M. (1981). Substitutes are teachers, too! Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 66.

Jentzen, A.E., & Vockell, E.L. (1978). Substitute teachers: Current status and some suggestions for improvement. NASSP Bulletin, 62, 84-88.

Koelling, C.H. (1983). Substitute teachers - School policies and procedures in the North Central region. Education, 104, 155-171.

McIntire, R.G., & Hughes, L.W. (1982). Houston program trains effective substitutes. Phi Delta Kappan, 63, 702.

TABLE 1

Quantitative Description of Respondents by Region

| Region | Number in Pool | Responding From Pool | | Number Non-usable |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | N | %[1] | |
| New England | | | | |
| ME, NH, VT, MA, RI, CT | 48 | 27 | 56 | 0 |
| Middle Atlantic | | | | |
| NY, NJ, PA | 24 | 12 | 50 | 2 |
| East North Central | | | | |
| OH, IN, IL, MI, WI | 40 | 24 | 60 | 1 |
| West North Central | | | | |
| MN, IA, MO, ND, SD, NB, KS | 56 | 36 | 64 | 0 |
| South Atlantic | | | | |
| DE, MD, DC, VA, WV, NC, SC, GA, FL | 65 | 58 | 89 | 0 |
| East South Central | | | | |
| KY, TN, AL, MS | 32 | 21 | 66 | 0 |
| West South Central | | | | |
| AR, LA, OK, TX | 32 | 17 | 53 | 0 |
| Mountain | | | | |
| MT, ID, WY, CO, NM, AZ, UT, NV | 64 | 36 | 56 | 0 |
| Pacific | | | | |
| WA, OR, CA, AK, HI | 40 | 28 | 70 | 0 |
| TOTAL | 401 | 259 | 65 | 3 |

[1] Percentage rounded to nearest whole percent.

TABLE 2

Frequencies and Percentages of Responses to Questionnaire Items

| | Frequency | Adjusted % |
|---|---|---|
| 1. Number of students in your district? | | |
| A. 2,499 or fewer (very small) | 101 | 39.8 |
| B. 2,500 - 9,999 (small) | 97 | 38.2 |
| C. 10,000 - 24,999 (medium) | 29 | 11.4 |
| D. 25,000 or more (large) | 27 | 10.6 |
| 2. Are substitute teachers in your district required to have the same minimum academic degree as your regular teachers? | | |
| Yes | 169 | 65.3 |
| No | 90 | 34.7 |
| 3. Are substitute teachers in your district required to hold certification in the areas in which they substitute? | | |
| Yes | 37 | 14.3 |
| No | 222 | 85.7 |
| 4. Does your school system give its substitute teachers any kind of special consideration if they apply for a regular teaching job? | | |
| Yes | 160 | 62.7 |
| No | 95 | 37.3 |
| 5. Of the following materials, which does your school system require the general education teacher to make available to substitutes? | | |
| A. Lesson plans | 258 | 100 |
| B. Seating chart or list of pupils' names | 243 | 94.6 |
| C. Copies of textbooks | 247 | 96.1 |
| D. List of schedules, events, rules, etc. | 244 | 94.9 |
| E. Supplies, materials, and equipment | 238 | 92.6 |
| F. Appropriate keys | 161 | 62.6 |
| G. List of personal student information (e.g., disciplinary, emotional, or medical problems) | 128 | 49.8 |
| H. Other: Emergency (medical) | 10 | 3.9 |
| I. Other: Persons to call upon | 3 | 1.2 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6. | Of the following, which does your school system consider a PRIMARY factor considered in selecting a substitute teacher education? | | |
| | A. Past performance as a substitute | 230 | 89.8 |
| | B. Previous teaching experience | 165 | 64.7 |
| | C. Proximity to school | 50 | 19.6 |
| | D. Seniority | 25 | 9.8 |
| | E. Alphabetically from roster | 14 | 5.5 |
| | F. Rotation | 34 | 13.3 |
| | G. Principal's request | 215 | 84.3 |
| | H. Training/certification | 217 | 85.1 |
| 7. | Does your school system formally evaluate your substitute teachers? | | |
| | Yes | 60 | 23.4 |
| | No | 196 | 76.6 |
| 8. | If the answer to #7 was "Yes", who has primary responsibility for evaluating substitute teachers? | | |
| | A. Building Principal | 57 | 95.0 |
| | B. Assistant Principal | 25 | 41.7 |
| | C. Department Head | 2 | 3.3 |
| | D. Teacher Who Was Absent | 22 | 36.7 |
| | E. Central Office Administrator | 7 | 11.7 |
| 9. | If the answer to #7 was "Yes", how often are your district's substitute teachers evaluated? | | |
| | A. After each assignment | 20 | 33.3 |
| | B. After first assignment in building | 8 | 13.6 |
| | C. After 3rd assignment in same school | 8 | 13.6 |
| | D. After 10th assignment in same school | 1 | 1.7 |
| | E. At end of long-term assignment | 23 | 39.0 |
| | F. Monthly | 1 | 1.7 |
| | G. Quarterly | 3 | 5.1 |
| | H. Semiannually | 5 | 8.5 |
| | I. Annually | 12 | 20.3 |
| | J. At principal's discretion | 22 | 37.3 |
| | K. After exceptionally good or bad performance | 19 | 32.2 |
| | L. As needed | 9 | 15.3 |
| 10. | Can substitute teachers with poor performance records be removed from your district's roster of available substitutes without a complicated procedure? | | |
| | Yes | 198 | 92.1 |
| | No | 17 | 7.9 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 11. | Does your district have specific limits regarding the number of times a substitute teacher may refuse an assignment and still be kept on active file? | | |
| | Yes | 27 | 10.7 |
| | No | 225 | 89.3 |
| 12. | If the answer to #11 was "Yes", how many times may a substitute teacher refuse an assignment and still be kept on active file? | | |
| | 1 time | 2 | 8.3 |
| | 2 times | 1 | 4.2 |
| | 3 times | 6 | 25.0 |
| | 4 times | 1 | 4.2 |
| | 5 times | 5 | 20.8 |
| | more than 5 | 9 | 37.5 |
| 13. | Approximately how many general education substitute teachers are in your district's active file for the 1984-85 school year? | | |
| | A. 1-20 | 62 | 25.1 |
| | B. 21-40 | 41 | 16.6 |
| | C. 41-60 | 33 | 13.4 |
| | D. 61-80 | 17 | 6.9 |
| | E. 81-100 | 18 | 7.3 |
| | F. 101-150 | 26 | 10.5 |
| | G. 151-200 | 11 | 4.5 |
| | H. 201-250 | 5 | 2.0 |
| | I. 251 or more | 34 | 13.8 |
| 14. | Approximately how many general education substitute teachers are on duty in your district during a typical day? | | |
| | A. less than 10 | 139 | 54.5 |
| | B. 10 - 19 | 52 | 20.4 |
| | C. 20 - 29 | 19 | 7.5 |
| | D. 30 - 39 | 7 | 2.7 |
| | E. 40 - 49 | 5 | 2.0 |
| | F. 50 - 99 | 10 | 3.9 |
| | G. 100 - 199 | 10 | 3.9 |
| | H. 200 or more | 13 | 5.1 |

15. Approximately what percentage of the general education substitute teachers in your district's active file are employed during a typical day?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. less than 10% | 121 | 48.6 |
| B. 10 - 19% | 63 | 25.3 |
| C. 20 - 29% | 25 | 10.0 |
| D. 30 - 39% | 16 | 6.4 |
| E. 40 - 49% | 8 | 3.2 |
| F. 50% or more | 16 | 6.4 |

16. Approximately what percentage of regular teachers do general education substitute teachers constitute for a typical day?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. less than 1% | 46 | 20.9 |
| B. 1 - 1.9% | 32 | 14.5 |
| C. 2 - 2.9% | 31 | 14.1 |
| D. 3 - 3.9% | 23 | 10.5 |
| E. 4 - 4.9% | 29 | 13.2 |
| F. 5 - 5.9% | 22 | 10.0 |
| G. 6 - 6.9% | 10 | 4.5 |
| H. 7 - 7.9% | 7 | 3.2 |
| I. 8 - 8.9% | 6 | 2.7 |
| J. 9 - 9.9% | 4 | 1.8 |
| K. 10% or more | 10 | 4.5 |

17. How would you describe the supply and demand for substitute teachers in your district?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Adequate | 131 | 51.4 |
| Surplus | 11 | 4.3 |
| Shortage | 112 | 43.9 |

18. If you encounter shortages of substitute teachers, in which areas are these encountered?

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| A. Elementary | 73 | 50.0 |
| B. Jr. High | 114 | 83.8 |
| C. High School | 135 | 88.8 |
| Content areas: | | |
| D. industrial arts | 144 | 96.6 |
| E. sciences | 149 | 98.0 |
| F. mathematics | 152 | 98.1 |
| G. reading | 73 | 77.7 |
| H. art | 89 | 84.8 |
| I. business education | 96 | 85.0 |
| J. music | 118 | 92.2 |
| K. PE | 67 | 69.8 |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 19. | If your district must employ a substitute teacher in an area in which you have a shortage of substitute teachers, how do you typically solve this problem? | | |
| | A. Use non-certified substitute | 157 | 64.9 |
| | B. Team-teach | 22 | 9.1 |
| | C. Cancel planning periods, etc. for other teachers | 33 | 13.6 |
| | D. Cancel specific classes | 5 | 2.1 |
| | E. Other | 25 | 10.3 |
| 20. | What is the minimum daily pay rate for substitute teachers in your district? | | |
| | A. $20 or less | 3 | 1.2 |
| | B. $21 - 25 | 19 | 7.5 |
| | C. $26 - 30 | 37 | 14.4 |
| | D. $31 - 35 | 69 | 27.4 |
| | E. $36 - 40 | 36 | 14.3 |
| | F. $41 - 45 | 27 | 10.7 |
| | G. $46 - 50 | 26 | 10.3 |
| | H. $51 or more | 35 | 13.9 |
| 21. | Are fringe benefits provided for substitute teachers in your district? | | |
| | Yes | 29 | 11.6 |
| | No | 220 | 88.4 |
| 22. | If the answer to #21 was "Yes", which specific benefits are provided? | | |
| | A. Social Security | 17 | 65.4 |
| | B. Teacher retirement | 15 | 57.7 |
| | C. Sick leave | 6 | 23.1 |
| | D. Personal/emergency leave | 4 | 15.4 |
| | E. Group hospitalization insurance | 3 | 11.5 |
| | F. Major medical insurance | 3 | 11.5 |
| 23. | Does your district provide orientation programs for your substitute teachers? | | |
| | Yes | 136 | 53.1 |
| | No | 120 | 46.9 |
| 24. | Does your district provide inservice training for your substitute teachers? | | |
| | Yes | 91 | 35.8 |
| | No | 163 | 64.2 |

| | Substitutes 26 | |
|---|---|---|
| 25. Does your school district provide district guidelines or procedures regarding..... | | |
| A. reporting procedures | 174 | 82.9 |
| B. responsibilites to school and children | 169 | 80.5 |
| C. professional rules and guidelines | 153 | 72.9 |
| D. building regulations | 168 | 80.0 |
| E. suggestions for classroom management | 156 | 74.3 |
| F. services available to substitutes | 106 | 50.5 |
| G. Substitute's handbook | 11 | 4.2 |
| H. Assignment for work | 2 | 0.8 |
| I. Responsibilites of reg. teacher, principal, and central office | 2 | 0.8 |
| J. Causes/procedures for removal of substitute | 1 | 0.4 |